

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 11-14 are all the claims pending in the application, including new claims 13 and 14 added by the present Amendment.

Claim 1 is objected to, because of the use of the phrase “an obtaining step of receiving a spectacle frame information.” Applicant follows the Examiner’s suggestion and amends this phrase by deleting the word “a” from this phrase.

Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant’s amendment of claim 1 corrects any antecedent basis problems with claims 2 and 5.

Claims 1-5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kato (JP 09-99444 A) in view of Logan et al. (US 4,711,035) and Wood et al. (US 5,053,971), and further in view of Blomberg et al. (US 6,242,065) or Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kato in view of Logan et al., Wood et al., and Blomberg et al. or AAPA, and further in view of Komatsu et al. (JP 06-191159). Applicant submits that the claims are not rendered obvious in light of the applied references, as detailed below.

Applicant submits that none of the applied references teach or suggest the limitation of claim 1 of a marking step of depicting production information of a spectacle lens including an edging mark, which indicates a first region of the lens remaining after an edging matched with an inner peripheral edge of openings of the spectacle frame in a second region, to be cut off by the edging, of a surface of the spectacle lens, and which functions as a boundary for appearance inspection, on the basis of the spectacle frame information after the step of forming the spectacle

lens. Since an edging mark of the present invention functions as a boundary for appearance inspection, the quality of only the region inside the edging mark may be guaranteed. Thus, even if defects are observed in a region outside the edging mark, these defects are negligible.

Accordingly, since the appearance quality may be guaranteed only for the region surrounded by the edging mark, it is possible to significantly reduce a variation in decided accuracy, and to significantly improve the production yield. Since it is not required to guarantee the appearance quality of the entire surface of a lens, a region whose appearance is to be inspected becomes narrower, with a result that it is possible to reduce the manpower and time for inspection and hence to reduce the lens production cost.

The applied references, on the other hand, do not teach or suggest that the edging mark is a boundary for appearance inspection. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5, 11 and 12 are allowable over the prior art for at least this reason.

Furthermore, Blomberg et al. relates to lens blanks for forming ophthalmic elements and the lamination of thermoplastic molded articles in the formation of ophthalmic elements. The Examiner cites col. 8, lines 53-59, as allegedly disclosing the limitation of “after the marking step, at least one step selected from the group consisting of a polishing step, a dyeing step, a hard coat formation step and an anti-reflection coating formation step, after which the edging mark remains on the spectacle lens” of claim 1. However, none of the references disclose or suggest that the edging mark remains on the spectacle lens after the at least one step is performed. In particular, Blomberg et al., the only reference that deals with any of the steps included in the “at least one step selected from the group consisting of ...” limitation, is silent with regard to this

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 09/701,634

aspect of the claim. Hence, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5 and 11 are believed to be allowable over the prior art.

Furthermore, the cited excerpt states that it is "the normal process of providing laminated lens products" that includes, *inter alia*, the hard coating and antireflective coating steps. Col. 8, lines 53-54. In other words, Blomberg et al. is directed to providing laminated lens products, but none of the other references relate to laminated lens products. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Blomberg et al. with the other references, and there is no suggestion to do so. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5 and 11 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Kato, Logan et al., Wood et al., and Blomberg et al. for this additional reason.

Likewise, Applicant submits that claim 12 is allowable over the prior art for at least the same reasons noted above regarding claim 1.

New claims 13 and 14 are added to further define the present invention. Applicant submits that these claims are allowable over the applied prior art, at least because the applied prior art does not disclose or suggest the claimed dyeing step.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

APPENDIX
VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

The claims are amended as follows:

1. (Three Times Amended) A method for producing a spectacle lens, comprising:
an obtaining step of receiving [a] spectacle frame information,
a step of forming the spectacle lens;
a marking step of depicting production information of the spectacle lens including an edging mark, which indicates [indicating] a first region of the lens remaining after an edging matched with an inner peripheral edge of openings of the spectacle frame in [the] a second region, to be cut off by the edging, of a surface of the spectacle lens, and which functions as a boundary for appearance inspection, on the basis of the spectacle frame information after the step of forming the spectacle lens; and
after the marking step, at least one step selected from the group consisting of a polishing step, a dyeing step, a hard coat formation step and an anti-reflection coating formation step, after which the edging mark remains on the spectacle lens.

Claims 13 and 14 are added as new claims.



Creation date: 11-21-2003
Indexing Officer: TJAMES - THERESA JAMES
Team: OIPEBackFileIndexing
Dossier: 09701634

Legal Date: 12-09-2002

| No. | Doccode | Number of pages |
|-----|---------|-----------------|
| 1 | SRNT | 1 |

Total number of pages: 1

Remarks:

Order of re-scan issued on